DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 102 EA 005 845

AUTHOR	Arend, Paul J.
TITLE	Teacher Selection: The relationships Between Selected Factors and the Rated Effectiveness of Second-Year Teachers.
INSTITUTION	Baltimore County Board of Education, Towson, Md.
PUB DATE	Jun 73
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Research; *Effective Teaching; Elementary Schools; *Evaluation; Secondary Schools; Student Teaching; Surveys; Tables (Data); *Task Performance; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Education; Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Recruitment; *Teacher Selection
IDENTIFIERS	Baltimore

ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine the relationships between the rated performance effectiveness of the strongest and weakest newly employed teachers in their second year of teaching and selected characteristics of data available in their credentials utilized for their selection. The characteristics selected were prior references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate college grade-point average, location of student-teaching experience, sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position. The ratings of effectiveness were determined by principals and supervisors. From a total of 925 second-year teachers, 68 (7 percent) were rated as ineffective. Although there appeared to be no significant relationships between the majority of factors considered during the selection process and whether a teacher was rated most or least effective, a higher proportion of ineffective teachers were assigned without complete credentials. A short bibliography is provided. (Author)

ED 087102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 087102

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHER SELECTION:

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELECTED FACTORS AND THE RATED EFFECTIVENESS OF SECOND-YEAR TEACHERS

Research Project

Department of Personnel

Board of Education

of

Baltimore County

Maryland

---

by

Paul J. Arend, Ed. D.

Specialist - Staff Development

June 1973

EA 005 845

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful appreciation is extended to the Office of Educational Research, Board of Education of Baltimore County, for their advice and statistical computations done during the undertaking of this investigation. An additional expression of appreciation is extended to the other personnel and staff members who participated in the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....ii

INTRODUCTION.....1

PERSONNEL PROBLEM.....1

SELECTED LITERATURE.....3

RESEARCH PROBLEM.....8

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY.....8

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY.....9

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.....9

GENERAL RESEARCH INFORMATION.....11

PROCEDURES.....19

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY.....21

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....27

APPENDICES.....29

...that rare jewel, a dedicated understanding, and effective teacher.[1]

The term "accountability," with regard to public education, was the "in" word during the early 1970's. The call for accountability came from the President of the United States, Congress, other agencies of the federal government, state legislatures, state boards of education, local school boards, school administrators, teacher preparation institutions, and teachers. There was a concern that educators might become ensnared by equating the number of teachers on the market with the quality of education within the schools. It was stated that a surplus of teaching credentials did not guarantee all children a quality education. Accountability, according to Associate Executive Secretary of the NEA, D. D. Darland, could utilize the American teacher as "a most likely candidate for scapegoat of the 1970's."[2]

PERSONNEL PROBLEM

Statistics on teacher supply and demand during the early 1970's were disconcerting to personnel directors. A record 337,619 persons completed teacher preparation programs between September, 1971 and August 31, 1972. In addition to this, a supply of qualified former teachers desiring to return to teaching in the Fall of 1972 approximated 83,400 persons. To contrast the demand, in 1967 fifty-seven school

---

[1] Alexander Kendrick, Prime Time: The Life of Edward R. Murrow (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1969).

[2] Joseph Stocker and Donald F. Wilson, "Accountability and the Classroom Teacher," Today's Education, LX (March, 1971), 41-56.

systems reported 7,845 teacher vacancies, while seventy-one systems reported 820 teacher vacancies in 1972.[3]

Indications were that for the first time since World War II, more trained teachers were seeking work in a field where teacher applicants far outnumbered the existing vacancies. Personnel directors faced a different type of problem in staffing. There were mixed feelings of relief and fear: relief that the general teacher shortage was over, and fear that many trained teachers would not find employment. Personnel directors, at first delighted with the prospect of being able to pick and choose, found that they were inundated with applications. This shifted the workload from college campus recruiting to intensive screening.

The selection process had been easy in an era when there were few qualified applicants from which to choose and an abundance of vacancies to fill. Selection procedures were now a primary consideration by personnel directors. The mounting teacher salaries, mounting public pressure for quality teachers, and a call for accountability made incompetency inexcusable. There was no longer a teacher shortage.

Personnel specialists were aware that hiring of "marginal" candidates would receive closer scrutiny than ever before by boards of education and the public. Attention had to be given to total staff procurement and utilization with emphasis on relationships such as teaching references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate grade-point average, location of student-teaching experience,

---

[3]National Education Association, Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1972 (Washington: The Association, NEA Research Division, 1972-R8).

sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area for which teachers were selected.

SELECTED LITERATURE

Don Davis, then Associate Commissioner for Educational Personnel Development in the U.S. Office of Education, reported that much of the teacher-training provided by colleges left the beginning teacher with a false, rigid set of values, a lack of repertoire of effective instructional skills, an inability to change methods and curriculum materials, and an insensitivity to children as individuals.[4]

Student-Teaching

Indications were that student-teaching data were vital in screening beginning teachers; in particular, was information concerned with levels and subjects taught, length of experience, grade received, and the person who served as supervising teacher. With this frame of reference, Keefe determined that the entire area of reference checking in education needed a complete overnauling. Personal references appeared to be of little value. Professional and past employee references needed to be requested and personally checked by the personnel specialist.[5] Silberman supported Keefe in stating that teachers, in general, cited practice teaching as the most valuable part of their professional education. Teachers of teacher education concluded that whatever else in their program that might be dispensable, practice-teaching was not. In addition,

---

[4]Don Davies, "The Supply and Demand Tranquilizer," Personnel News for School Systems, (Washington: Educational Service Bureau, Incorporated, October, 1970), 3-4 and 10.

[5]John E. Keefe, "Teacher Recruiting in an Expanding Market," Personnel News, (February, 1971), 3-4 and 10.

a large body of experience corroborated by some research, indicated that the supervising teacher exerted considerably more influence on the student-teacher's style and approach than did his college supervisor or education professors under whom he studied. The student-teacher, upon completing his training, tended to teach according to what he learned under his supervising teacher.[6]

Teacher Selection Survey

In July, 1972, The Educational Testing Service of New Jersey conducted a survey of opinions and attitudes held toward teacher selection. They surveyed 75 personnel directors in large school systems having 50,000 or more pupils.

According to the survey, 68 of the school districts reported that within the last three or four years there were definite revisions of policy changes and evaluative measures used in teacher selection. These changes were based on two factors: federal courts and agencies' pressures on racial balancing of staff and a general over-supply of teachers. It was also mentioned that personnel specialists claimed to have difficulty in interpreting evaluations of student-teaching and/or teaching performance ratings of applicants. Some personnel directors stated that it would require extensive training of personnel specialists to interpret evaluations.

Four major measures were used in the selection of teachers: college grades with a weight ranging from 5-30%, practice-teaching with a weight ranging from 10-50%, references and recommendations with a weight

---

[6]Charles E. Silberman, "Even Student Teaching is Dismal," Today's Education, LX (January, 1971), 22-25 and 63.

ranging from 10-70%, and the National Teachers Examination used by nine school districts with a weight ranging from 5-45%. Practice-teaching and references appeared to be accorded the greatest amount of weight in the selection process.

Personal qualities deemed most pertinent in selection processes were intellectual qualities (verbal ability, knowledge of area, and general education) with a weight ranging from 20-50%, effective qualities (enthusiasm, patience, and commitment to teaching) with a weight ranging from 20-50%, social qualities with a weight ranging from 10-40%, and physical qualities with a weight ranging from 10-25%.

The report compared the weight given college grades to the weight assigned to intellectual qualities. Though the latter tended to be viewed as very important, the most valid and reliable measures of intellectual qualities (college grades and the National Teachers Examination) were not weighted very heavily as selection measures.

In conclusion, the report indicated a desire by personnel directors for both a change and an awareness of new directions in regard to teacher selection procedures. The majority of the personnel directors who participated in the study indicated that they considered the complex skills involved in teaching were not predictable by any single selection measure. The survey returns revealed divergencies of school districts in their attitudes toward teacher education and methods of selection. The large number of applicants and the scarcity of positions presented increased pressure for more refined and efficient selection measures.[7]

---

[7] James R. Deneen, Lois C. Ferguson, and Susan S. Sherwin, "Teacher Selection: A Survey of Opinions and Attitudes of Personnel Directors in Large School Districts" (unpublished paper, Educational Testing Service, November, 1972).

The Aurora Experiment

In Aurora, Colorado, the question was asked whether time spent on screening teacher applicants by examination of placement files was worth the effort. A special study was devised to answer this question. The files of all applicants for 1971 were screened and those candidates selected to go through a special screening process had to qualify with high scores on the following criteria:

1. Successful rapport with young people of the age he will be teaching.
2. Ability to foster learning, preferably through individualized instruction.
3. Ability to accept change and to cope with adversity.
4. Continuous personal and professional improvement, including satisfactory scholarship.
5. High verbal ability and adequate physical stamina.[8]

Those applicants with high scores received a minimum of two interviews by a team during a 14-day interview period in March. There were 38 of these applicants selected to teach during the 1971-1972 school year.

In February of 1972, performance evaluations were completed on the 38 teachers screened and on the 28 teachers employed without use of the described screening procedure.

This study indicated that more than half (20) of those 38 screened were rated highly satisfactory by their principals and, except for two, all the rest were rated satisfactory. The ratings for the 28 employed without these selection procedures were: six were rated highly satisfactory, twelve were rated satisfactory, nine were rated as needing improvement, and one was rated unsatisfactory. There was a high corre-

---

[8]G.R. McConnell and Eugene A. Albo, "The Aurora Experiment," Personnel News, December, 1972), 7.

lation between the group interview ratings of the 38 teacher applicants screened and their quality of performance. The conclusion reached stated that a lack of screening was likely to result in the employment of less satisfactory teachers.[9]

Other Considerations

Several other considerations regarding selection were reported in the literature. While some school districts have indicated increases in the number of male elementary school teachers and an awareness of a better opportunity for a proper mixture of males and females, warnings have been issued to employ the most qualified applicant and not maintain a quota system. There were indications of the need to seek the necessary competent male or competent female to provide the balance. Another consideration was the need to prevent inbreeding and dependence upon local colleges and the local manpower market. It was stated that a more cosmopolitan approach to hiring should still be considered.

There was no doubt that the teacher supply and demand in the early 1970's presented an excellent opportunity and challenge to acquire the best qualified staff. Greater emphases were placed on pre-selection, hiring of teachers with more than formal certification, designs for new procurement sources, and improved staff balance. Hopefully, experts looked for outgrowths that would reduce turnover and supply a continuous flow of the proper type of applicants. There were also expectations for a reduced cost per hire figure.

---

[9] Ibid.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

In the school year 1971-1972, 925 teachers for all areas were newly employed by the Board of Education of Baltimore County. There were 477 teachers employed in the elementary area and 448 teachers employed in the secondary area.

The problem was to determine the relationships between the rated performance effectiveness of the strongest and weakest newly employed teachers in their second-year of teaching and selected characteristics of data available in their credentials utilized for their selection. This represented 151 teachers out of 925 newly employed second-year teachers. The characteristics selected were prior references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate college grade-point average, location of student-teaching experience, sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position. The ratings of effectiveness were determined by principals and supervisors.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to assessing the relationships between the selected factors and the measurement of rated effectiveness of only the best and poorest of all second year teachers within the school system. The performance rating of effectiveness of each teacher was limited to the teacher's supervisor or school principal. The form utilized was, by design, the same form used by the Department of Personnel as a reference form evaluation of the teacher prior to employment.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

There were three potential contributions of this study. First, it could serve as a review of present selection procedures for the employment of new teachers. Second, it could serve as a guide to the establishment of criteria for the employment of new teachers. Third, the study might have implications for refining or changing present selection procedures.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

The terms basic to this investigation were defined as follows:

Prior References

The term, prior references, as used in this study, refers to the teaching evaluation forms (See Appendix A) completed for each subject. Each subject had two separate prior evaluation forms. They were as follows: one evaluation form completed by the college supervisor of his student-teaching experience or his school principal for his teaching performance and another evaluation completed by his supervising teacher of his student-teaching experience or his school supervisor for his teaching performance.

Interview Scores

The term, interview scores, as used in this study, refers to the total number score an interviewer rated the subject at the time of his interview prior to employment (See Appendix B).

Place of Interview

The term, place of interview, as used in this study, refers to whether the teacher was interviewed in an office at the Department of Personnel or at a college.

Interviewer

The term, interviewer, as used in this study, denotes whether the interviewer was employed as a specialist in personnel or as another professional school person.

Degree Granting College

The term, degree granting college, as used in this study, refers to the location of the college which awarded the teacher his undergraduate degree, either in Maryland or outside the State.

Degree Level

The term, degree level, as used in this study, designates each subject's degree holding status as bachelors, masters, or masters plus.

Years of Teaching Experience

The term, years of teaching experience, as used in this study, refers to the total number of years a subject had taught. These years were grouped into categories of 0-2, 3-4, or 5 plus.

Undergraduate College Grade-Point Average

The term, undergraduate college grade-point average, as used in this study, refers to the cumulative grade-point average recorded on the subject's college transcript upon receipt of his bachelor's degree.

Location of Student-Teaching Experience

The term, location of student-teaching experience, as used in this study, refers to whether the candidate student-taught in a Baltimore County School or elsewhere.

Marital Status

The term, marital status, as used in this study, designates each subject's status as single, married, or other (separated, divorced, widowed).

Geographic Administrative Area of Present Teaching Position

The term, geographic administrative area of present teaching position, as used in this study, refers to one of the five geographic administrative areas for the public schools of the Board of Education of Baltimore County. They are as follows: southeastern, northeastern, central, northwestern, and southwestern.

Effective and Ineffective Teachers

The term, effective and ineffective teachers, as used in this study, refers to those teachers selected as subjects. The effective teachers are those selected by principals or supervisors as performing best among all teachers teaching in their second year in the Baltimore County School System. The ineffective teachers are those teachers selected by principals or supervisors as performing on the lowest level among all teachers teaching in their second year in the Baltimore County School System.

GENERAL RESEARCH INFORMATION

Locale of the Study

The Baltimore County, Maryland, public school system was selected as the locale for the study. Baltimore County was one of the twenty-four school systems in the State of Maryland. The City of Baltimore was not a part of the Baltimore County School System.

The Baltimore County School District was composed of 610 square miles of land surrounding Baltimore City on three sides. In 1973, the population of this county was approaching 700,000 people. The public school enrollment was more than 132,000 pupils with a professional staff approximating 7,250. It was the fourteenth largest school district in

the United States. Baltimore County was a combination rural-suburban-industrial-commercial-political unit with a diversified economy.

The pattern of grade grouping in the school system during the period of the study was basically six years of elementary school, three years of junior high school, and three years of senior high school. Students were housed in 159 separate school plants. These were as follows: 108 elementary schools, 24 junior high schools, 18 senior high schools, 3 vocational schools, and 6 special schools.

Description of the Group Studied

All persons included in the population of this study were teaching in their second year in Baltimore County. From the total of 925 teachers newly employed for the school year 1971-1972, the credentials of 151 teachers in their second year (1972-1973) were selected to be studied. The 151 teachers were selected as either being most effective or least effective: 77 most effective and 74 least effective. This was done to maximize the chance of detecting significant relationships from their personnel credentials. It did preclude generalizations about the total population. Thus, the 151 teachers selected were not intended to be a random sample of the total 925 second-year teachers. The group studied represented the extremes of the effectiveness of these teachers. The supervisors of the various areas were requested to submit evaluations on their best five second-year teachers and their five weakest second-year teachers. They were able to submit less names but not more. The school principals evaluated their regular elementary classroom teachers. Lack of data for some persons reduced the total study population to 145 subjects for one part of the study and 130 for another. The 145 subjects represented 16 areas of teaching. The number of subjects in each

area is presented in Table I.

Table I

Subjects and Teaching Areas

Area of Teaching and School Level	Number of Subjects Effective	Ineffective
Art		
Elementary	2	2
Junior	2	1
Senior	-	1
Business Education		
Senior	5	5
English		
Junior	4	1
Senior	1	4
Guidance		
Elementary	2	1
Home Economics		
Junior	4	4
Senior	1	1
Industrial Arts	5	5
Languages		
French	3	3
Spanish	2	-
Library		
Elementary	3	2
Junior	1	-
Senior	1	-

Table I (continued)

Mathematics		
Junior	2	4
Senior	3	1
Music		
Elementary	1	2
Junior	4	3
Senior	-	-
Physical Education - Boys		
Elementary	1	1
Junior	-	-
Senior	2	1
Physical Education - Girls		
Elementary	-	-
Junior	-	-
Senior	2	1
Science		
Junior	4	4
Senior	1	1
Social Studies		
Junior	4	5
Senior	1	-
Special Education		
All Areas	6	5
Elementary		
All Grades	10	10
TOTAL	77	68
GRAND TOTAL	145	

The 145 subjects were divided into two categories: 77 rated Effective and 68 rated Ineffective. An analysis of the characteristics of the teachers participating in the study is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Characteristics of Teachers
Rated Effective or Ineffective

Characteristic	Effective	Ineffective
Place of Interview		
Personnel Office	49	44
College	28	24
*Interviewer		
Personnel Specialist	66	55
Other	10	13
Degree Granting College		
In Maryland	44	36
Other	33	32
Degree Level		
Bachelors	64	58
Masters	12	9
Masters Plus	1	1
Years of Teaching Experience		
0-2 years	55	53
3-4 years	6	3
5 Plus years	16	12
Location of Student-Teaching Experience		
Baltimore County	37	20
Other	40	48
Sex		
Male	25	33
Female	52	35

Table 2 (continued)

Race		
Caucasian	72	63
Negro	4	4
Other	1	1
Marital Status		
Single	30	35
Married	47	33
Age		
22-26	56	45
27-31	7	10
32-36	1	7
37 and over	13	6
Geographic Administrative Areas		
Southeastern	14	22
Northeastern	12	14
Central	23	8
Northwestern	10	10
Southwestern	18	14

*Tally missing one due to incomplete data

The following null hypotheses were tested using a significance level, or alpha, of .05 for rejection.

Hypothesis I

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his prior references.

Hypothesis II

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his interview scores.

Hypothesis III

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the place of interview.

Hypothesis IV

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the interviewer.

Hypothesis V

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the degree granting college.

Hypothesis VI

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the degree level.

Hypothesis VII

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the years of teaching experience.

Hypothesis VIII

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the undergraduate college grade-point average.

Hypothesis IX

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and the location of his student-teaching experience.

Hypothesis X

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his sex.

Hypothesis XI

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his race.

Hypothesis XII

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his marital status.

Hypothesis XIII

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his age.

Hypothesis XIV

There was no relationship between the rated effectiveness of a teacher and his geographic administrative area of present teaching position.

Twenty-one teachers selected were not used as subjects for the multiple-linear regression analysis due to incomplete data from their records. This group included four teachers rated effective and 17 teachers rated ineffective. The teachers rated effective represented the areas of English, Spanish, mathematics, and the elementary school. The teachers rated ineffective represented the areas of business education, home economics, French, library, mathematics, physical education, science, special education, and the elementary school. Six of the above teachers rated ineffective were not used because of conflicting evaluations which invalidated them as being rated "ineffective." The information below in Table 3 indicates specific reasons for not including the above 21 subjects in the full study.

Table 3

Subjects Not Used

	Teacher Rating	
	Effective	Ineffective
Invalid Performance Ratings	-	6
Missing Interview Sheet Student-Teaching or Teaching	1	3
Missing Student-Teaching or Teaching Reference Sheets	3	6
Missing Reference Sheet(s) and Interview Sheets	-	2
TOTALS	4	17

PROCEDURES

Data used in this study were obtained through a survey of the population and teacher effectiveness ratings of those second-year teachers designated as the strongest or weakest. The data were utilized as criteria or predictors in the study. All data were collected during the first three months of 1973.

Effectiveness Ratings of Population Studied

The rated effectiveness scores of the teachers designated as the strongest or weakest were used as the criteria, or dependent variables, in this study. The effectiveness rating on each teacher was obtained from his supervisor in all areas except the elementary school classroom teacher. The effectiveness rating form for the elementary school class-

room teacher was completed by his principal. Each rater was requested to select his most effective second-year teachers and his least effective second-year teachers (See Appendix C). For each group, he was to select no more than five, but it could be less. The subjects were selected county-wide. The Director of Personnel explained the study orally to the raters, followed by a written communication.

The rating form utilized (See Appendix A) was the same one used to acquire evaluations of the subjects prior to their employment. This was used to permit better correlation of data and to assure that the subjects were being rated on the same traits. This Professional Reference Request form included 11 items. Each item was rated on the following scale: 5, Superior-Excellent; 4, Good-Capable; 3, Acceptable-Adequate; and 2, Less Than Adequate.

Predictor Information of Population Studied

The factors of prior references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate college grade-point average, location of student-teaching experience, sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position were obtained for each subject through the personnel files of the teacher. The factors were used as predictors or independent variables.

Description of Statistical Methods

The major purpose of the present study was to determine which of the variables listed above were statistically significant predictors of the criterion ratings. Two statistical methods were employed, the chi-square test and multiple-linear-regression.

A chi-square test was used to test whether some of the factors of the sample departed significantly from the distribution between effective and ineffective teachers. The factors tested in this manner were as follows: place of interview, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, location of student-teaching experience, sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position.

It appeared likely that the set of four predictors (prior references-two each, interview scores, and undergraduate grade-point averages) were likely to be inter-related and could affect the predictive ability of each other. A multiple-linear-regression program was utilized [Multiple Linear Regression (5 variable), 9810A Hewlett-Packard Calculator]. This program computed the predictive power of each variable.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATION OF THE STUDY

The problem of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in rated effectiveness between the most and least effective second-year Baltimore County teachers as selected by their supervisors or principals and factors of prior references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate college grade-point average, location of student-teaching experience, sex, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position. The effectiveness ratings were done by supervisors and principals on their selection of their strongest and weakest second-year teachers. This represented 151 subjects out of 925 total second-year teachers.

There were no significant relationships in the total rated effectiveness of the most and least effective second-year teachers and their prior references, interview scores, place of interview, interviewer, degree granting college, degree level, years of teaching experience, undergraduate grade-point average, race, marital status, age, and geographic administrative area of present teaching position. There were significant relationships between the rated effectivenss of teachers and their location of student-teaching, and sex.

There was a significant relationship between strongest and weakest teachers (as rated) and whether the location of their student-teaching experience was in Baltimore County or elsewhere. A significantly higher proportion of teachers who student-taught in Baltimore County were rated most effective. Listed in Table 4 is the statistically significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and location of student-teaching experience for the strongest and weakest teachers.

Table 4

Relationship Between Teacher Effectiveness
and Location of Student Teaching for
145 Strongest and Weakest Second-Year Teachers

Location of Student Teaching Experience	Teacher Rating	
	Most Effective	Least Effective
Baltimore County	37	20
Other	40	48
$\chi^2 = 5.2591$	Significant at the .05 level	
d.f. = 1		

There was a significant relationship at the .05 level between those teachers rated effective or ineffective and their sex. A significantly higher proportion of teachers who were females were rated effective. Listed in Table 5 is the statistically significant relationship between teaching effectiveness and sex for the strongest and weakest teachers.

Table 5

Relationship Between Teacher Effectiveness and Sex of 145 Strongest and Weakest Second-Year Teachers

Sex	Teacher Ratings	
	Most Effective	Least Effective
Male	25	33
Female	52	35
$\chi^2 = 4.1197$	Significant at the .05 level	
d.f. = 1		

Further statistical testing was done considering the following factors together; effectiveness, location of student-teaching, and sex. There were no significant differences in the proportion of teachers rated effective as to whether or not they had student-taught in Baltimore County and their sex.

Serendipital Findings

An analysis of the data for the 151 strongest and weakest second-year teachers indicated the following serendipital findings:

These findings may not apply to the total group of 925 second-year teachers.

Though not significant, there was a positive relationship between those second-year teachers rated most effective and teachers ages 20 to 26 or 37 and over. Second-year teachers in this study listed with ages 27 to 36 were more likely to be rated least effective.

The data indicated that the largest number of teachers rated most effective in this study were found to be teaching in the central geographical administrative area, while the largest number of teachers rated least effective in this study were found to be teaching in the southeastern geographic administrative area.

There also appeared to be definite indications that those second-year teachers employed without completed personnel credentials were more apt to be rated ineffective than effective. (The Department of Personnel discontinued this practice in 1972).

Comments written on the interview sheets provided subjective evaluations of these second-year teachers prior to their employment. Those second-year teachers were rated as most effective had on nine different interview sheets remarks that another member of the family also taught. Eleven different persons indicated involvement in many activities and a variety of interests. A number showed very high scholastic averages and were on the Dean's List. The interviewers indicated that ten different persons had had experiences as full-time aides, substitutes, or other school positions. General remarks for these teachers included the following: "encouraged," "will do well," "much energy," "good communicative abilities," "mature," "enthusiastic," "cooperative," "dependable," "responsible," and "good human relations." Two different

teachers rated most effective had been selected and provided pre-service training by Baltimore County under an Educational Professions Development Act Project.

Those second-year teachers who were rated as least effective had a variety of subjective comments written on their interview sheets. Five different persons were recorded by the interviewer as being only "acceptable" in several categories. General remarks written for those teachers included the following: "a prince," "best seen at college," "could handle discipline," "so nice, it's amazing," "lovely," "poor personality," "academic degrees most impressive," "need-can't fill," "first impression poor on interview," "bubbly person," "good background," "outstanding person," and "said college courses 'null'." A number of these people had comments written on their interview sheets such as "quiet," "timid," "mild mannered," "reserved," and "calm."

There was an analysis of other data found in the credentials of those 68 teachers in this study rated as ineffective. In regard to student-teaching experiences, the following were listed for different persons: practice-taught in same school assigned to as a teacher, student-taught in a rural community, poor student-teaching evaluations from Baltimore County supervising teacher, had problems in student-teaching, emotional problems, poor letter of reference, vague college evaluation, problems with student-teaching (nephew of a vice-principal), planning could use improvement, student-taught in a small town in Pennsylvania, and tense with some difficulties. In four situations the person had been a long-term substitute before being given a regular contract, two had requested assignment changes, one had a poor credit standing, and one appeared to have been assigned during the interview.

The significance of this study involved several dimensions. First, from a total of 925 second-year teachers, 68 or 7% were rated as ineffective. Second, even though there appeared to be no significant relationships between the majority of factors considered during the selection process and whether a teacher was rated most or least effective, a higher proportion of ineffective teachers were assigned without complete credentials. Third, in the process of trying to balance a staff by sex, males not as highly effective as females may have been selected. Judgment had to be made as to the value of this practice. Fourth, those teachers in the study who had their pre-service training in Baltimore County appeared to have acquired a better orientation for successful teaching. Therefore, it was most important that supervising teachers of student-teachers receive a significant amount of prescribed training for their job. Indications were that teachers not having student-teaching in Baltimore County needed more structured orientation into the system. Last, even though a small proportion of second-year teachers were found to be ineffective, careful perusal of credentials provided clues to help eliminate this number in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Davies, Don. "The Supply and Demand Tranquillizer," Personnel News for School Systems, (October, 1970), 3-4, 10.

Deneen, James R., Lois C. Ferguson, and Susan S. Sherwin. "Teacher Selection: A Survey of Opinions and Attitudes of Personnel Directors in Large School Districts." Unpublished Paper, Educational Testing Service, November, 1972.

Keefe, John E. "Teacher Recruiting in an Expanding Market," Personnel News for School Systems, (February, 1971), 3-4, 10.

McConnell, G.R. and Eugene A. Alba. "The Aurora Experiment," Personnel News for School Systems, (December, 1972), 7.

National Education Association. Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools. Washington: The Association, Research Report, 1972.

Rhodes, Eric (ed.). "Editorial," Personnel News for School Systems, (November, 1966), 2.

_____. "Editorial," Personnel News for School Systems, (May, 1970), 2.

_____. "EPDA Awards Grants for Teacher Recruiting," Personnel News for School Systems, (February, 1969), 7, 10.

Silberman, Charles E. "Even Student Teaching is Dismal," Today's Education, LX (January, 1971), 22-25, 63.

Stocker, Joseph and Donald F. Wilson. "Accountability and the Classroom Teacher," Today's Education, LX (March, 1971), 41-56.

APPENDIX A

DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

PROFESSIONAL REFERENCE REQUEST

_____ is applying for a/an _____ position in the public school system of Baltimore County. Please evaluate him/her in comparison with others you have known in a like position. Your reactions to the items below will assist us in appraising qualifications and determining possible placement. All responses will be respected as strictly confidential information.

PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIP

Student teacher under my supervision - - - - - (____)
Teacher under my supervision - - - - - - - (____)
Other: _____

From Month	From Year	To Month	To Year	Length Years	Length Months

Subject(s) taught and/or other assignment: _____

If a former employee, please state reason for leaving: _____

NUMERICAL RATINGS USED IN STUDY

QUALIFICATION CHARACTERISTICS	5 Superior --Excels	4 Good-- Capable	3 Acceptable --Adequate	2 Less than Adequate	Unknown
Effectiveness of speech--clarity, expression, organization					
Effectiveness in planning and preparing work					
Subject matter competency					
Skills (special subject teachers): art, music, technical, language, etc.					
Varies teaching to ability levels of pupils; employs imagination					
Effectiveness in individualized instruction situation					
Exercises appropriate pupil control and classroom management					
Motivates pupils; relates well; gains pupil confidence					
Staff relationships--works well with others; willing to assist					
Responsibility in fulfilling responsibilities; attendance					
Apparent health and emotional stability					

HOW WOULD YOU CLASSIFY THIS PERSON AS A FELLOW/PROSPECTIVE STAFF MEMBER?

(____) an acceptable staff member (____) a most desirable staff member
(____) a desirable staff member (____) not desired as a staff member

If the decision were yours, would you employ/re-employ this person? YES(____) NO(____)

PLEASE COMMENT AS NECESSARY ON THE REVERSE SIDE TO COMPLETE YOUR EVALUATION.

_____ _____ _____
Your signature Title/Position Date

_____ _____
School, College or District City and State

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
Towson, Maryland 21204

Date of Availability_____
Early Contract: Yes___ No___

INTERVIEW RECORD

Salary Data_____

NAME_____ COLLEGE_____

Address_____ Date_____

_____ Phone_____

MAJOR FIELD (List appropriate courses)	CR.	MINOR FIELD	CR.	Certification Estimate:
_____	___	_____	___	1. Certified (_____) (NCATE, Reciprocity or Md. Certificate)
_____	___			
_____	___	CUM. AVERAGE: (_____)		2. Provisional (_____)
_____	___			_____
_____	___	Major Average: (_____)		3. Uncertain (_____)

TEACHING PREFERENCE:

Elementary_____ Subject/Grades_____

Junior High_____ Subject(s)_____

Senior High_____ Subject(s)_____

Location Preference_____ Car: Yes___ No___

PRACTICE TEACHING:

Subject and/or Grade_____ Achievement Grade_____

Conditions, features:_____

_____

SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES, VOLUNTEER WORK, RELATED EXPERIENCE, HONORS, ETC.

_____

_____

_____

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

_____

_____

_____

MILITARY OBLIGATION: Yes___ No___
Draft Classification____

Active Duty Military Service:
From_____To_____

Appearance

	Excellent	Good	Acceptable	Improvement Needed	Remarks
Grooming					
Dress					
Overall Appearance					

Voice and Speech

Fluency, Organization				
Diction				
Expression				
Modulation				
Overall Effect				

Personality Qualities

Alertness				
Poise				
Maturity				
Enthusiasm				
Attitude				
Interview Participation and Response				

Comments:

INTERVIEW RATING SCORE USED IN STUDY

Evaluation of 8 = 5.0
7 = 4.8
6 = 4.5
5 = 4.0

No one was evaluated below a "5" = to a 4.0

Evaluation
(Circle numerical rating)

8 - 7 Recommend highly
6 - 5 Recommend
4 - 3 Recommend with reservations
(___) Do not recommend
(___) More information needed

Interviewer_____

Place of interview: College_____ Office_____

APPENDIX C

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF BALTIMORE COUNTY
TOWSON, MARYLAND 21204

The Department of Personnel is in the process of reviewing selection procedures as they relate to transcripts, references, interview results, and other available evaluative materials. In the process, we are attempting to study the result of placement related to second year teachers. We will try to determine if there are certain types of information, training, and preparation that seem pertinent to the success of one type of teacher and not to another.

Would you be kind enough to provide us with the names and evaluations of five of your best second year teachers (yellow reference form with "A" in upper right-hand corner) and for five of your weakest second year teachers (yellow form with "Z" in upper left-hand corner)? In both cases, please also provide us on the reverse side of the forms with any additional information that you believe will be helpful in evaluating why this teacher has been non-successful or successful. It is our hope that a study of such information will aid us in being even more successful in our employment procedures and results.

In completing the yellow form, please provide the following:

(1) Name of teacher

(2) Subject taught

(3) Qualification characteristics

(4) Overall evaluation

(5) Your signature (to be used only if more information is desired or clarification is needed).

Please plan to return this to my office by January 20, 1973.

DP-12/72